B 178
.G7
Copy 1

B178
.G7
B 178
.G7
Copy 1

THE TREATMENT

OF

PHILOSOPHY AND PHILOSOPHERS

BY THE

GREEK COMIC POETS

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

W. R. GREY

Professor of Latin and French in Davidson College

BALTIMORE
THE FRIEDENWALD COMPANY
1896

B178
.G7

THE TREATMENT

OF

PHILOSOPHY AND PHILOSOPHERS

BY THE

GREEK COMIC POETS

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

W. R. GREY
Professor of Latin and French in Davidson College

BALTIMORE
THE FRIEDENWALD COMPANY
1896

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON

B178
G7

Bibliography.

The following are the principal works used in preparing this dissertation:

Ritter and Preller. Historia Philosophiae Graecae. Gothae, 1888.

Mullach. Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum. 3 vols. Paris, 1860–1881.

Zeller, Ed. Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer Geschichtlen Entwicklung. Vol. I, ed. 4. Leipzig, 1876.

Zeller, Ed. Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy. Translated by Sarah F. Alleyne and Evelyn Abbott. New York, 1886.

Lorenz, A. O. F. Leben und Schriften des Koers Epicharmus. Berlin, 1864.

Ahrens, H. L. De Dialecta Dorica, p. 435 foll. (fragments of Epicharmus' works). Gottingae, 1843.

Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta. Th. Koch. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1880–88.

Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum. Ed. Minor. Aug. Meineke. Berlin, 1847.

Bergh, Th. Commentationum de Reliquiis Comoediae Atticae Antiquae Libri Duo. Leipzig, 1838.

Diogenes Laertius. Ed. Hübner. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1828–31.

Athenaeus. Ed. Kaibel. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1887–90.

Couat, A. Aristophane et l'Ancienne Comédie Attique. Paris, 1889.

Denis, J. La Comédie Grecque. Vol. II. Paris, 1886.

Ditandy, A. Etudes sur la Comédie de Ménandre. Paris, 1854.

LC Control Number

tmp96 028831

Comedy and Philosophy in Sicily.

In beginning a study of the treatment of philosophy and philosophers by the Greek comic poets, it will be sufficient if we go back to the time when we first find comedy in a formulated state; when it seemed to have lost almost all kinship with the rude forms from which it was developed and was recognized and cultivated as a branch of literature. But it is not to Athens that we must go to find comedy in the early part of the fifth century B. C. as something more than the farces of Megarian youths or the loosely constructed scenes of a Susarion. For this we must go to Sicily.

The period that we have to consider is the period in which fall the brilliant reigns of Gelon and Hieron. Athens had not yet reached the height of her greatness, but in power and in the encouragement given to literature and art, Syracuse was the first of Grecian cities. It was here that Simonides and Bacchylides, attracted by the fame of the latter of these two rulers, came to add to the splendor of the already famous city. It was here that Pindar composed odes in honor of the victories of Hieron and Chromius, or again to console Hieron when prostrated by a severe illness; here Aeschylus wrote and put on the stage some of his tragedies, and here the only Sicilian comic poets of this period labored and wrote.

In Epicharmus we have, if not the creator of comedy, the first great comic poet among the Greeks, and in him we find what half a century later in Athens would have been almost an impossibility, a comic poet and philosopher in one person. As such he was recognized in antiquity. Plato in the Theaetetus (152 E) speaks of him as *ὁ ἄκρος τῆς κωμῳδίας*, and he also mentions his philosophical views. Diogenes Laertius (VIII 3) says that he was a disciple of Pythagoras and numbers him among the philosophers. In III 12 he calls him a comic poet. Iamblichus (v. P. XXXVI 266) and Plutarch (Numa VIII) mention him as a Pythagorean. But whether he can be put with a definite school is doubtful, as his fragments do not show a slavish adherence to any philosophy. In some cases he appears as an inde-

pendent thinker; here he shows kinship with Pythagoras, here with Heraclitus, and here perhaps with Xenophanes. But there can be no doubt that he was more deeply influenced by the philosophy of Pythagoras than by that of Heraclitus or Xenophanes.

When Epicharmus came from Megara in Sicily to Syracuse in 483 B. C., the latest date at which he could have come, the doctrines of Pythagoras had been known in Italy and very probably in Sicily for nearly fifty years. Pythagoras was dead, but the association which he had founded in Lower Italy lived on for nearly half a century. The man who had worked a revolution in restoring law and order in Crotona and whose fame had spread over all Lower Italy,[1] could not have remained unknown in the neighboring island of Sicily.

We are told that he visited several Sicilian communities, and that the people of Himera, Agrigentum, and Tauromenium, on becoming imbued with his doctrines, overthrew the tyrants ruling in those cities,[2] and that Pythagoras himself joined the people of Agrigentum in a war with Syracuse.[3] Porphyry, in his "Life of Pythagoras" (27), speaks of his miraculous appearance on the same day to his followers in Metapontum in Italy and in Tauromenium in Sicily. Probably little weight can be attached to any of these reports, yet they serve to show that Pythagoras stood in close relations with the Sicilian as well as with the Italian Greeks.

Xenophanes, after coming to Magna Graecia, spent part of his time in Sicily. He is said to have lived in Catana and in Zancle (Diog. Laert. IX 18), and later in life we find him at the court of Syracuse, where, as in other places, he recited his poems expressing his philosophy of the universe. Here, too, he found a field for philosophical investigations; for in the impressions of fish and other marine animals found in the rock quarries of Syracuse he saw interesting proofs of his theory that the world had once been dissolved in water.[4] Empedocles did not begin his career as a philosopher until later, but his popularity contributes something towards showing that philosophy was not regarded with the same disfavor at this time in Sicily as in Athens in the latter part of the same century. Political freedom had come to an end in Syracuse, but there was still room for free thinking. We see here no opposition to those who departed from national and

[1] Porphyry, v. P. 22.
[2] Porphyry, v. P. 21.
[3] D. L. VIII 40.
[4] Orig. Phil. 29.

established beliefs. Hieron tolerated Xenophanes with his monotheism and his ridicule of Homer. Not even the sophistic Simonides, "the first poet who wrote for gold" and thereby degraded his sacred calling into that of a mere money-maker's, seems to have received any censure. The struggle between science and religion which we find going on in Athens in the time of Old Comedy had not yet commenced, and when it began it did not begin in Syracuse.

We can see how it was possible under these circumstances for Epicharmus to assume the role of a comic poet and philosopher and yet make a success. There are no grounds for the statement of Iamblichus (v. P. XXXVI 266) that Epicharmus, owing to his fear of Hieron, refrained from engaging openly in philosophical teaching, but expressed his conceptions of Pythagoreanism in the form of comedies. From the progress that philosophy had made in Sicily it is impossible that he could have escaped detection so easily, and besides there was no cause for concealment. From the anecdotes told by Plutarch[1] about Hieron and Epicharmus we infer that Epicharmus did not fear the tyrant. Xenophanes, perhaps the most outspoken of philosophers, did not find it necessary to conceal his philosophy, and why should Epicharmus? Hieron was anxious to make his court famous for the variety and eminence of the literary men assembled there, and the presence of the greatest comic poet then living could have been no small addition.

I shall now consider some fragments from the works of Epicharmus which show his philosophical leaning. One of his sayings that was very familiar in antiquity and was quoted frequently, is the following (Ah. 177):

νόος ὁρᾷ καὶ νόος ἀκούει τἄλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά.

Grysar[2] takes this as nearly identical with a verse from Xenophanes:

οὖλος ὁρᾷ οὖλος δὲ νοεῖ, οὖλος δέ τ' ἀκούει,

but there is a wide difference between the two. The latter part of the verse from Epicharmus, *τἄλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά*, excludes all kinship with that from Xenophanes, and Weckler[3] supposes that

[1] Apophth. reg. et imp. 75 C. Quomodo adul. ab amico internoscatur, 68 A.

[2] De Doriensium Comoedia Quaestiones, 131.

[3] Kleine Schriften, I 353.

he speaks out here in direct opposition to Eleatic pantheism. But however this may be, there can be little doubt that in this verse he gave expression to a Pythagorean dogma which distinguished between the creative cause and dead matter. If we conclude with Zeller (I, p. 333) that this doctrine did not belong to the original stock of Pythagorean philosophy, but that Anaxagoras was the first to teach it (Arist. Met. 3, 984, 13), then we must regard this theory as an independent production of the Sicilian poet, and whether he taught it or not he gave utterance to it before it was taught by Anaxagoras.[1]

The following is another fragment that has a Pythagorean coloring (Ah. 96):

Εὔμαιε, τὸ σοφόν ἐστιν οὐ καθ' ἓν μόνον,
ἀλλ' ὅσσα περ ζῇ πάντα καὶ γνώμαν ἔχει.
καὶ γὰρ τὸ θῆλυ τᾶν ἀλεκτορίδων γένος,
αἰ λᾷς καταμαθεῖν ἀτενές, οὐ τίκτει τέκνα
ζῶντ', ἀλλ' ἐπώζει καὶ ποιεῖ ψυχὰν ἔχειν.
τὸ δὲ σοφὸν ἁ φύσις τόδ' οἶδεν ὡς ἔχει
μόνα· πεπαιδεύται γὰρ αὐταυτᾶς ὕπο.

Even Lorenz, who sees in the other fragments from the plays of Epicharmus only comic sport, cannot deny that in this one there is something more. He thinks that the poet expresses here the Pythagorean doctrine of the soul of the world, the divine breath which extends throughout all nature and manifests itself in the instinct of the brute as well as in the intelligence of man. But it is hardly necessary to conclude with Lorenz that this fragment is from a play containing light philosophical discussions and composed for a select circle of hearers in Syracuse. Other fragments that should be placed with those just given have been preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus and Plutarch, but I quote from Ahrens. In fragment 151 we have

καθαρὸν αἶκα νόον ἔχῃς, ἅπαν τὸ σῶμ' ἐσσὶ καθαρός.

In fragment 146,

εὐσεβὴς νόῳ πεφυκὼς οὐ πάθοις κ' οὐδὲν κακὸν
κατθανών· ἄνω τὸ πνεῦμα διαμενεῖ κατ' οὐρανόν.

Again in 152,

εὐσεβὴς βίος μέγιστον ἐφόδιον θνατοῖς ἔπι.

[1] See Weckler, 353.

In 126,

> *συνεκρίθη καὶ διεκρίθη καπῆλθεν, ὅθεν ἦλθεν, πάλιν,*
> *γᾶ μὲν εἰς γᾶν, πνεῦμα δ' ἄνω, τί τῶνδε χαλεπόν; οὐδὲ ἕν.*

Finally in fragment 147,

> *οὐδὲν ἐκφεύγει τὸ θεῖον· τοῦτο γιγνώσκειν τὺ δεῖ·*
> *αὐτός ἐσθ' ἁμῶν ἐπόπτας ἀδυνατεῖ δ' οὐδὲν θεός.*

Nothing can bear more clearly than these fragments the stamp of Pythagoreanism, in accordance with which purity and piety in life insured a happy lot after death, while an impure life brought punishment, the soul returning to the air or being imprisoned according as the life had been pure or impure.[1]

Fragment 97 shows some kinship with a fragment from Xenophanes:

> *θαυμαστὸν οὐδὲν ἁμὲ ταῦθ' οὑτῶ λέγειν*
> *καὶ ἀνδάνειν αὐτοῖσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ δοκεῖν*
> *καλῶς πεφύκειν. καὶ γὰρ ἁ κύων κυνὶ*
> *κάλλιστον εἶμεν φαινέται, καὶ βοῦς βοΐ,*
> *ὄνος δ' ὄνῳ κάλλιστόν [ἐστιν] ὗς δ' ὑΐ.*

In the fragment from Xenophanes (Clem. Alex. Str. V 715 P) we find

> *ἀλλ' εἴτοι χεῖρας γ' εἶχον βόες ἠὲ λέοντες*
> *καὶ γράψαι χεῖρεσσι καὶ ἔργα τελεῖν ἅπερ ἄνδρες*
> *ἵπποι μέν θ' ἵπποις, βόες δέ τε βουσὶν ὁμοίας*
> *καί κε θεῶν ἰδέας ἔγραφον καὶ σώματ' ἐποίουν*
> *τοιαῦθ' οἷόν περ καὐτοὶ δέμας εἶχον ὁμοῖον.*

Clemens Alexandrinus (Str. VII 841 P) represents Xenocrates as saying almost the same thing with regard to the different races of men, that each race forms its gods like to the members of this race, the Ethiopian black and flat-nosed, the Thracian red-haired and blue-eyed. Lorenz thinks that the passage from Epicharmus is of such a comic tone that no importance can be attached to the thought expressed in it. There may be a comic vein running through it, but there are no grounds for concluding that the poet is here ridiculing the doctrine of Xenophanes, and the resemblance between the fragments is too close to leave any doubt as to their kinship.

[1] Diog. Laert. VIII 31; Zeller, I 419.

The following fragment (Ah. 95), preserved for us by Diogenes Laertius (III 14), was taken from the writings of Alcimus, who quoted it to show that the germs of Plato's doctrine of ideas were to be found in Epicharmus,

A. ἆρ' ἐστιν αὔλησίς τι πρᾶγμα; *B.* πάνυ μὲν ὦν.
A. ἄνθρωπος ὢν αὔλησίς ἐστιν; *B.* οὐδαμῶς.
A. φέρ' ἴδω τί δ' αὐλητάς; τίς εἶμέν τοι δοκεῖ;
ἄνθρωπος; ἢ οὐ γάρ; *B.* πάνυ μὲν ὦν. *A.* οὐκ ὢν δοκεῖ
οὑτῶς ἔχειν [τοι] καὶ περὶ τὠγαθοῦ; τό γα
ἀγαθόν τι πρᾶγμ' εἶμεν καθ' αὔθ' · ὅστις δέ κα
εἴδῃ μαθῶν τᾆν', ἀγαθὸς ἤδη γινέται.
ὥσπερ γὰρ αἰκ' αὔλησιν αὐλητὰς μαθὼν
ἢ ὄρχησιν ὀρχηστάς τις ἢ πλοκεὺς πλοκὰν
ἢ πάν γ' ὁμοίως τῶν τοιούτων, ὅ, τι τὺ λᾖς
οὐκ αὐτὸς εἴη χ' ἁ τέχνα τεχνικός γα μάν.

The dialectical method pursued here is very much like that followed by Plato, and it serves to show something of the philosophical mind of the poet, but whether Plato made use of Epicharmus to get new ideas in this line cannot be known, and it is not of vital importance here.

Diogenes Laertius has preserved another fragment (Ah. 94), but this reflects the philosophy of Heraclitus:

A. αἴ ποτ' ἀριθμόν τις περισσόν, αἰ δὲ λᾖς τὸν ἄρτιον
ποτθέμεν λᾖ ψᾶφον ἢ καὶ τᾶν ὑπαρχουσᾶν λαβεῖν
ἢ δοκεῖ καί τοι τόχ' ὡὐτὸς εἶμεν; *B.* οὐκ ἐμὶν τάχα.
A. οὐδὲ μὰν οὐδ' αἴ ποτὶ μέτρον παχυαῖον ποτθέμεν
λᾖ τις ἄτερον μᾶκος ἢ τοῦ προσθ' ἐόντος ἀποταμεῖν
ἔτι χ' ὑπάρχοι κεῖνο τὸ μέτρον; *B.* οὐ γάρ. *A.* ὧδε νὺν ὄρη
καὶ τὸς ἀνθρώπους · ὁ μὲν γὰρ αὖξεθ', ὁ δέ γα μὰν φθίνει,
ἐν μεταλλαγᾷ δὲ πάντες ἐντὶ πάντα τὸν χρόνον.
ὁ δὲ μεταλλάσσει κατὰ φύσιν κωὔποκ' ἐν τωὐτῷ μένει,
ἄτερον εἴη κα τόδ' ἤδη τοῦ παρεξεστακότος.
καὶ τὺ δὴ κἠγὼ χθὲς ἄλλοι καὶ νῦν ἄλλοι τελέθομες
καὐθις ἄλλοι κωὔποχ' ὡὐτοὶ [τελέθομες] κατὸν λόγον.

The fragments preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus and Plutarch were probably taken from a didactic poem, *Περὶ Φύσεως*, which Epicharmus is supposed to have written. Diogenes Laertius (VIII 78) says of him that he left writings in which he dis-

coursed on nature, and Ennius entitled "Epicharmus" a didactic poem in which he set forth doctrines of a Pythagorean stamp. Ennius wrote this in trochaic tetrameter, and it is probable that he found both the form and the substance of his poem in a work of the same kind by Epicharmus.

Lorenz (p. 165) points out the fact that while no philosopher of this period used trochaic tetrameter for didactic verse, yet it had been used by Archilochus in works of an erotic, parainetic, and satirical nature, and by Solon in poems in which he defended himself against the attacks of his enemies. He thinks therefore that Epicharmus, who had a decided preference for this meter, introduced it into didactic poetry. Whatever may have been the nature of the poem or poems from which the fragments preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus and Plutarch were taken, there is little doubt that those preserved by Diogenes Laertius (Ah. 94, 95, 96, 97) were taken from comedies. Both the dialogue which occurs in them and the meter (iambic trimeter) of two of them exclude the supposition that they were taken from a didactic poem.[1]

Alcimus quoted the last fragment in support of his view that Plato got his doctrine of the flux of all sensible objects of perception from Epicharmus. Lorenz (p. 116) sees in this as well as in the preceding fragment only a piece of dialectical sport, and refers to it the *λόγος αὐξανόμενος* so often used by the sophists, and attributed by Plutarch (Adv. Stoic. de Comm. Natt. 1083) to Epicharmus. But we cannot deny that we have here the Heraclitean doctrine of the constant flux of all things. Plato, in the Theaetetus, 152 E, in speaking of this doctrine, says that it was held by Pythagoras, Heraclitus and Epicharmus. Whether Plato had in mind the passage from Epicharmus when he wrote the Theaetetus, or whether Alcimus had in mind the passage from the Theaetetus when he quoted these lines from Epicharmus, makes little difference. Plato gives it as the doctrine of Epicharmus, and there can be no doubt that he was well informed on the subject.

These fragments from the comedies of Epicharmus show that he did not confine himself to the Pythagorean school, but that he studied other systems as well; and that while following his profession as a comic poet he uttered here and there sayings, whether put in the form of dialogue or otherwise, which show

[1] Lorenz, p. 100.

that he was deeply influenced by the philosophical speculations of his age. But it is not necessary to conclude that he designed to impart philosophical truths from these thoughts embodied in his comedies. He was first and foremost a comic poet. The testimony of antiquity, and the lines left from his poems, unite in placing this beyond doubt. His great aim as a comic poet must have been to amuse his hearers, but despite this fact, if he was influenced by philosophy, his writings would show more or less his philosophical tendencies. But we have seen from Diogenes Laertius (VIII 78) that he did not confine himself entirely to comedy. His object in writing the book or books mentioned was evidently to express his views on nature. Nothing can be more striking than the difference between Epicharmus and the comic poets who came after him. They confined themselves, even in their attacks upon the philosophers, mostly to absurdities. If we judge of their knowledge of philosophy from their writings, we conclude that they knew almost nothing about it, and it is not until we come to the very close of Greek comedy that we find a change in this respect. But the poet who "endued comedy with a plot and imparted unity to it" was also a philosopher.

The Treatment of Philosophy in Old Comedy.

Comedy in Sicily seems to have died with Epicharmus. There was no great comic poet to take his place, and during the short reign of Thrasybulus and the supremacy of the democracy which followed it, few inducements were offered to poets in Syracuse in comparison to those offered there during the reign of Hieron. It was at this time that oratory began to be recognized as an art, and the literary talent of Syracuse as well as that of Leontini was exerted principally in that direction. The theatre of comedy was now transferred to Athens, and there its surroundings were entirely changed. Epicharmus wrote his comedies to please the court of Hieron. Politics were of course excluded, and he was restricted largely to the "representation of Sicilian character and life." In Athens the poets wrote to win popular applause, and there was no restriction as to the subjects of which they might treat. Greece was at that time in the midst of the religious revival that sprang up after the Persian wars, and while the Sicilians had appeared indifferent to the spread of new doctrines, the Athenians were ready to oppose any departure from the religion of their fathers. After

the reign of Hieron no inducements were offered to philosophers to go to Syracuse except such as may have presented themselves to the wandering sophists, but the glory which the Athenians had gained in beating back the Persian invasions, the genius of such men as Themistocles and Pericles, and the enthusiasm that pervaded the whole Athenian people, had placed Athens at the forefront of Grecian states. Here, as nowhere else, the sophists saw an inviting field, and we find that Protagoras made it one of his principal lecturing points during the forty years that he travelled through Hellas. Here we find Gorgias of Leontini, Hippias of Elis, Prodicus of Ceos, and Thrasymachus of Chalcedon. Anaxagoras, the friend and probably teacher of Pericles, made Athens his home for the thirty years following 462 B. C. Parmenides and Zeno the Eleatic spent some time here (Plat. Parm. 127 B), and it is also here that we find in the time of Old Comedy the atheistic philosopher Hippo. In addition to these men, Athens had in Socrates a philosopher of her own. If we add to the circle of young men who gathered around him the disciples of each of these philosophers and sophists, we see that here, as nowhere else, philosophy was attracting attention. Such a state of things as existed in Sicilian comedy, a comic poet and philosopher in one person, would have been almost an impossibility in Athens. The Attic comic poets were eager to gain popular applause, and no one of them would have been willing to hazard his chance of success by assuming the role of a philosopher in addition to that of a comic poet. Comedy in Athens was a state institution, and the state was opposed to philosophy, at least to philosophy as taught by Hippo and Anaxagoras.

The poet who first attacked the philosophers from the stage and began the war upon them, which lasted almost as long as Attic comedy itself, was Cratinus. It would be interesting to know whether the popular outburst of indignation which resulted in the banishment of Anaxagoras was preceded and influenced by the attack of Cratinus upon Hippo. The date of the Panoptae, in which he satirized the philosopher as well as the time when Hippo was in Athens, is unknown. It was brought out before the Clouds of Aristophanes, as we learn from the scholium to line 96. From line 1044 of the Wasps we infer that it preceded the Clouds a considerable time. Aristophanes there professes to have given his hearers something new in comedy when he brought out the Clouds, which he could not have claimed if the Panoptae had been

fresh in the memory of the people. The comedy very probably belongs to the early part of the poet's career, coming near the time of the Thracian Women. In this, Cratinus took the initiative in political comedy, and then his satire knew no bounds. He attacked everything that afforded material for comedy, and it is not strange that he soon saw in Hippo an object for satire.

From the fragments left from the Panoptae we do not know whether Cratinus attacked other philosophers who may have been in Athens or devoted the whole play to Hippo. Even of the treatment that Hippo received the fragments give us no clear notion, as they are scant and his name does not appear in them. We learn more from two scholia than from the fragments of the play. One of these scholia is to line 96 of the Clouds of Aristophanes, and from it we learn that Cratinus ridiculed Hippo for teaching that the heavens were an oven and that men were charcoal to be consumed in it. Aristophanes in l. 96 of the Clouds represents Socrates as teaching the same thing. The scholiast to Clemens Alexandrinus Protrepticus 20 states that Cratinus charged Hippo with impiety. Of Hippo's philosophy or of the extreme to which he went in opposing the Hellenic religion we know very little. Aristotle (Met. I 3) places him in the same school with Thales, but adds that he is not worthy to be compared with Thales as a philosopher. Athenaeus (610 *b*) calls him *ὁ ἄθεος*. From the scholia referred to, Hippo received, to some extent at least, the same treatment that Socrates received in the Clouds. Whether he was represented as professing to teach how to make the worse cause appear the better we cannot tell; this, however, is the opinion of the scholiast.

The following fragment from the Panoptae (K, I 61) was directed against the investigating spirit of philosophy which was not content with searching for the causes of natural phenomena, but was also attacking the national religion:

κρανία δισσὰ φορεῖν, ὀφθαλμοὶ δ' οὐκ ἀριθμητοί.

Bergk (p. 181) thinks, and perhaps rightly, that the chorus from which the play took its name was composed of the disciples of Hippo, and he takes the fragment as referring to the chorus as it appeared on the stage. To the disciples of Hippo he refers also the following (K, I 61):

ἀλλοτριογνώμοις, ἐπιλήσμοσι, μνημονικοῖσιν.

These, says Bergk, were suitable terms in the eyes of the Greeks to apply to the philosophers, who were regarded as occupying themselves with what they should leave alone, while they neglected those things that were especially necessary.

In another fragment (K, I 60) Hippo is accused of the love of boys:

μισεῖς γὰρ τὰς γυναῖκας, πρὸς παιδικὰ δὲ τρέπῃ νῦν.

In a fourth fragment, of which I give Bergk's emendation, Hippo is probably compared to a certain Aristodemus, a shameless fellow:

(οὗτος δ') Ἀριστόδημος ὡς ἀσχημονῶν
ἐν τοῖς Κιμονείοις ἀνὴρ ἐρειπίοις.

No mention is made of Hippo in connection with these passages, but it is improbable that they were directed against any one else than the philosopher or one of his disciples. Bergk (183 fol.) discusses these lines and concludes that Cratinus represented Hippo here as addicted to shameful lust, in order to show how far the pursuit of philosophy alienated men from honesty and piety. But from such fragments we cannot draw satisfactory conclusions, and even with the help of the scholiasts referred to, the knowledge of the treatment that Hippo received is very meagre. This much, however, is clear: that just as Cratinus stands as the pioneer in political comedy, so he stands as the pioneer of the comic poets in their opposition to philosophy, and that the characteristics that he ridiculed were similar, in some respects at least, to those ridiculed by Aristophanes in the Clouds. The Panoptae is not only the predecessor of the Clouds, but very probably the model on which it was formed. The example set by Cratinus and the attitude of the state must have exerted great influence on Aristophanes. Of the two poets we should expect more violent opposition to philosophy from Cratinus, for he had lived through the Persian wars, through times when there were no philosophers in Greece, and would naturally have been more hostile to the changes that he saw going on around him than Aristophanes, who was born after philosophy gained a foothold in Athens. We have seen that the atheistic teaching of Anaxagoras met with decided opposition from the state, and how dangerous such teaching was regarded may be seen from the fact that in 411 B. C., when Protagoras was banished from Athens, his books were brought into the market-place and

publicly burned.[1] Some features of sophistic teaching were odious to conservative Athenians, and that an orator like Eualthus[2] was supposed to have acquired his art, and doubtless to some extent his character, in the school of Protagoras, could not have added to the popularity of the wandering professors. It was therefore quite natural for the comic poets to denounce the philosophers, but it would be unfair to say that in arraying themselves on the popular side they were merely seeking the favor of the people. They were men, and as such were interested in the welfare of their state. It would, however, be far from true to conclude that they were actuated from patriotic motives alone in their attacks upon philosophy. The state was opposed only to certain features of philosophic teaching, and in later comedy not even to these. But the comic poets went beyond the opposition of the state and continued to ridicule the philosophers when opposition from the state had ceased. In some cases, especially in early comedy, they were doubtless sincere, but we must grant that the desire to gain applause, to make the subject in hand ridiculous, and to raise a laugh, outweighed every other consideration. Aristophanes himself recognized this as one of the essentials in comedy, as he tells us in the Knights (525) that Magnes lost his popularity in his old age because he had ceased to be amusing. This, together with the facility with which the characteristics touched on could be turned into ridicule, will account for much of the satire directed against the philosophers. Again, the ill-feeling between the two departments seems to have been mutual. In the Clouds (296) Socrates is represented as speaking of the comic poets as a contemptible set, and Aelian (v. H. II 13) says that he went to the theater only when Euripides brought out a new play. Athenaeus (220 *a*) tells us that most of the philosophers were abusive of the comic poets. The fact that comedy was a state institution only gave the poets a better opportunity for inveighing against a class by whom they themselves were abused. The liberty granted to the poets of Old Comedy was simply boundless. No man was so inoffensive, so retired or so influential that he might not be dragged upon the stage to make sport for the people. How much the people themselves delighted in this personal abuse may be seen from the fact that

[1] Eusebius, Praep. Ev. XIV 19.

[2] The scholiast to Ar. Wasps 590 speaks of him as *ῥήτωρ συκοφάντης*, and *ἐστι τις πονηρός*, and Ar. says about as much. See Bergk, 97 foll.

the law passed in 440 B. C. to restrict the license of comedy was repealed after three years.[1] We may infer that not even Pericles, who was doubtless influential in having the law passed, was able to withstand a demand for its repeal.

Aristophanes stands, whether justly or not, as the principal character in Old Comedy in its opposition to philosophy. When he brought out the Clouds he had before him the example of Cratinus in his attack upon Hippo, and he knew the attitude of the state towards such philosophers as Anaxagoras. Before this he had written mostly political comedies, the last being the Knights, in which he followed the custom of the comic poets and selected as the principal character a well-known contemporary. For the Clouds he wanted a representative philosopher. Socrates was at this time the only one of any importance in Athens. Gorgias and Protagoras were there only occasionally, and being foreigners, neither was so well suited as Socrates, whose personal appearance and peculiarities, together with the circle of young men gathered around him, made him well known to all classes of citizens. What Aristophanes wished to show the Athenians was how the teaching of one of their fellow-citizens threatened the welfare of the state. These, says Couat (279), are the reasons that governed the poet in selecting his leading character.

The philosophers whom Aristophanes attacks in the person of Socrates are Hippo, Anaxagoras, Diagoras and Protagoras, the only philosophers who had been prominent in Athens. In lines 94–97 of the Clouds, Socrates is represented as teaching that the heavens are an oven and that men are simply charcoal to be consumed in it. This, as we have seen, is to be referred to the teachings of Hippo. Socrates is also represented here as taking money for his instruction, and as teaching how to make the worse cause appear the better, charges that were brought against the sophists, especially against Protagoras.[2] In lines 248–53 he is represented as denying the existence of the gods and introducing new divinities, the clouds. We recognize in this the teachings of Diagoras,[3] and in line 830 Socrates is called *ὁ Μήλιος*. In line 225 he is engaged in speculating about the sun, and here we see the philosophy of Anaxagoras, who taught that the sun was a red-hot mass of metal.[4] The only passage that bears any resemblance to the teaching of Socrates is in line 227 foll., where he gave as

[1] Scholia Ar. Wasps, 67. [2] Arist. Rhet. II 24, 11. Gell. N. A. V 3, 7.
[3] See Scholia to Ar. Frogs, 320. [4] Sotion in Diog. Laert. II 12.

his reason for suspending himself in a basket, that he could not carry on his investigations properly if he did not suspend his mind and mix the subtle thought with the kindred air, that he must be out of reach of the influence of the earth, inasmuch as it had a tendency to draw the moisture of the thought to itself. This bears some resemblance to what Socrates is represented as saying in the Phaedo (66 A) in reference to the soul's being hindered in its search for the truth by the body.

Couat (287) says that Aristophanes having selected Socrates as the principal character for the comedy, could not avoid inconsistencies, and that in giving him the characteristics of the different sophists and philosophers he simply collected the current reports about him without taking pains to verify them. Whether the cold reception of the Clouds was due in any measure to the unfairness of the play or not, Aristophanes had overestimated the popular feeling against philosophy. He had been too zealous, and he received a rebuke for it. That he felt this keenly can be seen from the parabasis of the Clouds as it now stands, and also from the parabasis of the Wasps. But his remarks here show that his disappointment arose solely from the fact that he had not been awarded the first prize for a comedy which he regarded as his best work. In the Wasps (1047) he tells the spectators that they had never heard better comic verses, and that he considered them clever enough to see the merits of the play. He had given them something new, and such a poet deserved to meet with success. But they had rejected him and given the first and second prizes to Cratinus and Ameipsias, vulgar fellows, he calls them (Clouds 520 f.).

Little importance can be attached to the absurd things Socrates is represented as doing, as they were necessary to the success of the play, and it may be questioned whether he himself regarded the whole play as of much consequence. But as Couat (311) says, his reference to it in the Apology shows that neither he nor the Athenians had forgotten it. He regarded, however, with more seriousness the reports that his enemies had secretly circulated about him—reports told the jurors when they were children and more likely to believe false representations. In consequence of this they had grown up with false notions about his teachings. Denis takes this as an attempt on the part of Plato to show that Aristophanes was not responsible for the charges brought against Socrates.

It is worthy of note that Aristophanes did not abandon the Clouds after the first attempt, but reproduced it. Diodorus (XIII 8), in giving an account of the events of the year 415 B. C., states that Diagoras of Melos was accused of atheism and fled from Athens, whereupon the Athenians offered a talent to any one who should kill him. Aristophanes in the Birds (1072) refers to the same thing, and in the Clouds (830) he calls Socrates *ὁ Μήλιος*. Bergk (176) infers from this that the second edition of the Clouds was brought out shortly after Diagoras fell into disrepute. Assuming this—and it is the most natural inference—the attitude of the state towards Diagoras was what induced Aristophanes to reproduce the play, having found, as he thought, a favorable time for attacking the philosophers.

Ameipsias, as has been mentioned, brought out the Connus at the same time that Aristophanes brought out the Clouds, and from Athenaeus (218 *c*) we infer that several philosophers or disciples of a philosopher were introduced in the play. From the fragments left we know only of Socrates, and it is probable that he and his disciples formed the group of investigators referred to by Athenaeus. That these two plays, both ridiculing Socrates, were brought out at the same time may seem to indicate that philosophy was attracting more than usual attention, but it has no more significance than that the unique character of Socrates presented a good subject for comedy and that he was the principal philosopher in Athens. The offences for which he was ridiculed in the fragment from the Connus (K, I 602) were his idleness and indifference to personal comfort:

Σώκρατες ἀνδρῶν βέλτιστ' ὀλίγων, πολλῶν δὲ ματαιόταθ', ἥκεις
καὶ σὺ πρὸς ἡμᾶς; καρτερικός γ' εἶ, πόθεν ἄν σοι χλαῖνα γενοίτο;
Β. τουτὶ τὸ κακὸν τῶν σκυτοτομῶν κατ' ἐπήρειαν γεγένηται.
οὗτος μέντοι πεινῶν οὕτως οὐπώποτ' ἔτλη κολακεῦσαι.

According to Diogenes Laertius (II 27), Socrates was introduced here in the garb of a philosopher, but it is not probable that he was ridiculed on account of his philosophical views. His reference in the Apology to a certain comic poet indicates that Aristophanes stood alone in making an attack upon his philosophy through the medium of comedy. Connus was the music teacher of Socrates, and it is known that Socrates did not study music until late in life. Plato in the Euthydemus (277 C) represents him as saying that his youthful schoolfellows jeered him

and called Connus an old man's teacher. It must have been an amusing sight to see an old man trudging to school with a crowd of boys, and we may safely conclude that it was this side of Socrates' life that was ridiculed by Ameipsias. From the information given by Plato and Xenophon, he was represented here just as he appeared to the Athenians. The last verse of the fragment is quite different in tone from the ridicule to which the philosopher was subjected in the Clouds; it praises him in one respect, and we have no reason for doubting that it is genuine praise.

This play was awarded the second prize over the Clouds (Arg. V), which was awarded the third. We know nothing of its artistic merits, but it was superior to the Clouds in at least one respect, it came near representing Socrates as he was, and this was a point in its favor.

Aristophanes and Ameipsias were not the only comic poets who ridiculed Socrates. In a fragment from an unknown comedy of Eupolis' (K, I 351) he is ridiculed for the same thing as in the fragment from the Connus of Ameipsias, but the tone is much more severe, and approaches that at the close of the Clouds:

μισῶ δὲ καὶ τὸν Σωκράτην τὸν πτωχὸν ἀδολέσχην,
ὃς τἄλλα μὲν πεφρόντικεν,
ὁπόθεν δὲ καταφαγεῖν ἔχοι τοῦτου κατημέληκεν.

In another fragment from an unknown play of Eupolis' (K, I 355) he is represented as a thief:

δεξάμενος δὲ Σωκράτης τὴν ἐπίδειξιν
Στησιχόρου πρὸς τὴν λύραν, οἰνοχόην ἔκλεψεν.

There seems to be some kinship between these verses and the passage in the Clouds (197) where Socrates is spoken of as a clothes thief. The scholiast to the Clouds (96) says that Eupolis, in the few words in which he mentioned Socrates, abused him more than Aristophanes did in the whole of the Clouds. One would infer from this that Eupolis did not introduce him in a play, but in a third fragment from the works of the same poet (K, I 352) he is represented as a prating sophist, and we see from the verse that he was one of the characters in the play:

ἀλλ' ἀδυλεσχεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκδίδαξον, ὦ σοφιστά.[1]

[1] Etymol. M. p. 18, 8.

Another poet of this period who ridiculed Socrates was Callias. In a fragment from the Prisoners (K, I 696) he makes him responsible for the haughty bearing of a certain character:

Α. τί δῆ σὺ σεμνεῖ καὶ φρονεῖς οὕτω μέγα;
Β. ἔξεστι γάρ μοι. Σωκράτης γὰρ αἴτιος.

Callias and Eupolis are not less severe in their criticisms than Aristophanes, and all three poets unite in placing Socrates in the same class as the sophists. It is not merely his grotesque figure and his eccentricities that are satirized, it is his character and the corrupt influence of his teaching, a fact that makes it very probable that none of them made a distinction between him and such men as Diagoras and Protagoras. Two years after the appearance of the Clouds (Ath. 218 C) Eupolis brought out the Flatterers, in which Protagoras was ridiculed. We have no evidence that he was the principal character in the play; this, however, may be inferred from the fragment in which he is mentioned and its likeness to a passage in the Clouds:

ἔνδον μέν ἐστι Πρωταγόρας ὁ Τήιος
ὃς ἀλαζονεύεται μὲν ἁλιτήριος
περὶ τῶν μετεώρων, τὰ δὲ χαμᾶθεν ἐσθίει.

This bears some resemblance to the lines in the Clouds (95–97) in which Socrates is first mentioned:

ἐνταῦθ' ἐνοικοῦσ' ἄνδρες οἱ τὸν οὐρανὸν
λέγοντες ἀναπείθουσιν ὡς ἔστιν πνιγεὺς
κἄστιν περὶ ἡμᾶς οὗτος, ἡμεῖς δ' ἄνθρακες.

It is almost identical with a line from an unknown play of Aristophanes' (M. 337), evidently directed against some philosopher:

ὃς τὰ μὲν ἀφανῆ μεριμνᾶ, τὰ δὲ χαμᾶθεν ἐσθίει.

We learn from the argument to the Peace of Aristophanes that Eupolis was awarded the first prize for this play, but whether he profited by the experience of Aristophanes and selected characters more deserving of satire, or succeeded for other reasons, can only be conjectured.

Phrynichus composed a play called the Connus, but as we have only the title of the play left we know nothing of its nature except so much as may be learned from the name and the Connus of

Ameipsias. To the same period belongs the Sophists of Plato. From the few fragments that remain it cannot be known what sophists were ridiculed, or whether the satire was severe. One fragment refers to Prometheus (M. 381), and Meineke thinks that these are the words of Protagoras, whom Plato in the dialogue of the same name (320) represents as telling the fable about Prometheus. The prejudice against the sophists was stronger than that against those who restricted their teaching to philosophical investigations pure and simple. Their professing to be able to make men so skillful in the art of speaking that they could make the worse cause appear the better carried with it an element of fraud. Besides this they stooped to take pay, which in the eyes of conservative Athenians was an unpardonable sin.

The Treatment of Philosophy in Middle Comedy.

When Middle Comedy began, the philosophical surroundings in Athens had undergone a change. What became of Hippo we do not know. Anagoras and Diagoras, as has been mentioned, were accused of atheism and had to leave the state. Protagoras was banished on the same charge in 411 B. C., and on his way to Sicily was drowned. Twelve years later Socrates was put to death, and thus one of the principal representatives of the new learning was silenced. Gorgias was still living and perhaps still teaching. Whether he taught in Athens after this time we do not know; he could not, however, have been regarded as much more than a worn-out old man. But so far was philosophy from becoming extinct that it now became more widespread than ever. The Socratic schools founded by Euclides of Megara, Antisthenes of Athens, Phaedo of Elis, Aristippus of Cyrene, now came into existence, and in 387 B. C. Plato founded the Academy. Pythagoreanism had come to life again in Italy, and under the leadership of Archytus of Tarentum assumed the form of a great community. Philosophy seems to have been almost everywhere—in Libya, in Italy, in Thebes, in Elis, in Eretria, in Megara, as well as in Athens. If we had nothing but the fragments of the comic poets of this period, we should conclude, and rightly, that philosophy flourished in Athens then as never before. The plays devoted to this subject were more numerous than in the preceding period. The Plato and the Pythagorean of Aristophon, the Pythagorizusa of Alexis, and a play of the same name by Cratinus junior, were all devoted to the philosophers; and from

the fragments of the Tarentini of Cratinus and a play of the same name by Alexis it is probable that in these comedies also the philosophers were an important feature. There is no evidence that any poet of this time devoted a play to the sophists, but it could not have been for the lack of material, for the frequent references to them show that they were as numerous as in the time of Old Comedy.

With the exception of the Plato of Aristophon, all the plays that were devoted to a special school of philosophers during this period were devoted to the Pythagoreans, but the numerous references to philosophy from other plays show that the subject aside from the Pythagoreans was unusually popular for the comic poets. The cause of this must have been due to the spread of philosophy, and especially to the founding of the Academy in Athens. It was not due to a growing opposition to free thought on the part of the comic poets. The fragments left from their works show that they were less violent in their criticism of the philosophers than the poets of Old Comedy. But the philosophers are still ridiculed, they still prate, they still speak foolishness, and the prejudice against the sophists has not entirely died out.

The place of Socrates in Old Comedy was now taken by Plato and his disciples, but there was no sophist who took the place of Protagoras in the Flatterers of Eupolis, and perhaps in the Sophists of Plato. Single philosophers here and there were made the objects of ridicule, but no one of them attracted much attention in comparison with Plato. Not even the Cynics with their monotheism, "their contempt for temples, vows, sacrifices and prayers," provoked the criticism that Plato did. The circle of men who gathered around him in the Academy made him a conspicuous figure in Athens. Besides this he was the principal philosopher there, just as Socrates had been in the time of Old Comedy, and this will doubtless account largely for the fact that the comic poets mention him so often. There is, however, no comment as to the soundness of his theology, nor on the general effect of his teaching, unless it is regarded as productive of idleness and as having a tendency to give his disciples affected ways. It is only external characteristics that provoke criticism, and if we can judge from the comic fragments, what the philosophers believed and taught was a matter of little concern to the poets of this period. We see this not only in the case of Plato, but in the case of the Pythagoreans and all the other philosophers men-

tioned. Old Comedy occupied itself in its criticisms largely with absurdities, but the attacks of Cratinus upon Hippo, of Aristophanes upon the distorted character of Socrates, and of Eupolis upon Protagoras, show that they also went farther. In Middle Comedy it is only the absurdities or alleged absurdities of the philosophers that attract attention. They are no longer regarded as the opponents of the national religion and the sowers of evil. We cannot but conclude that the conservatism of the time of Old Comedy has given way to liberalism, that the religious revival that swept over Greece after the Persian wars has lost its hold upon the people and that we are living in a new age.

This change in the object of criticism is as striking as that in the tone of criticism, and the change in both can only have been brought about by a favorable attitude of the people towards philosophy. In the time of Old Comedy the state, as we have seen, banished Anaxagoras and Protagoras, set a price upon the head of Diagoras, and put Socrates to death; but with the death of Socrates the opposition of the state seems to have ended. The fact that the Cynics were allowed to teach without molestation shows that a revolution had taken place in favor of philosophy, for they opposed the Hellenic religion, and were as heterodox in this respect as Xenophanes had been. That this change in the attitude of the people should have influenced the comic poets is just what we expect, and if the poets went beyond the popular feeling, it was due only to the nature of their profession and to the example set by the poets of Old Comedy. There are, however, no grounds for concluding that they were in sympathy with the philosophers. The time had not come for that; it was only an age of toleration. It is true that we find nowhere in Middle Comedy the violent expressions of Eupolis, such as:

μισῶ δὲ καὶ τὸν Σωκράτην τὸν πτωχὸν ἀδολέσχην —

nor the abuse that we find in Aristophanes, but not a single poet of this period shows that he regarded philosophy with favor. Eupolis had called Socrates a beggarly prater, and Alexis, in a fragment from the Parasite (K, II 364), refers to the work carried on by Plato and his disciples as idle talking:

ἢ μετὰ Πλάτωνος ἀδολεσχεῖν κατὰ μόνας.

In a fragment from the Ankylion of Alexis (K, II 297) we find

λέγεις περὶ ὧν οὐκ οἶσθα· συγγενοῦ τρέχων
Πλάτωνι, καὶ γνώσει λίτρον καὶ χρόμμυον.

The second verse of this probably refers to Plato's teaching of concepts, an example of which we have in a fragment from a comedy of Epicrates, but the object here is to ridicule Plato's teaching as utterly useless, and Denis (II 368) is right when he takes *λίτρον καὶ κρόμμυον* as equivalent to nothing. In a fragment from the Dexidemides of Amphis(K, II 239) Plato is ridiculed for his sullen look, and from this passage we see that he was a character in the play:

ὦ Πλάτων,
ὡς οὐδὲν οἶσθα πλὴν σκυθροπάζειν μόνον,
ὥσπερ κοχλίας σεμνῶς ἐπηρκὼς τὰς ὀρφῦς.

According to a fragment from Ophelio (K, II 294), Plato's books are dull,

λιβυκόν τε πέπερι, θυμίαμα, βιβλίον
Πλάτωνος ἐμβρόντητον.

In a passage from the Antaeus of Antiphanes (K, II 23) we have a satire on the daintiness of Plato or some philosopher of the Academy:

ὦ τάν, κατανοεῖς τίς ποτ' ἐστὶν οὑτοσὶ
ὁ γέρων; β. ἀπὸ τῆς μὲν ὄψεως Ἑλληνικός·
λευκὴ χλανίς, φαὸς χιτωνίσκος καλός,
πιλίδιον ἁπαλόν, εὔρυθμος βακτηρία,
βεβαία τράπεζα· τί μακρὰ δεῖ λέγειν; ὅλως
αὐτὴν ὁρᾶν γὰρ τὴν Ἀκαδήμειαν δοκῶ.

In a fragment from the Nauagus of Ephippus (K, II 257) we find the following satire on Plato and his disciples:

ἔπειτ' ἀναστὰς εὔστοχος νεανίας
τῶν ἐξ Ἀκαδημείας τις ὑπὸ Πλάτωνα καὶ
βρυσωνοθρασυμαχειοληψικερμάτων
πληγεὶς ἀνάγκῃ, λῃψιλογομίσθῳ τέχνῃ
συνών τις, οὐκ ἄσκεπτα δυνάμενος λέγειν,
εὖ μὲν μαχείρᾳ ζύστ' ἔχων τριχώματα,
εὖ δ' ὑποκαθιεὶς ἄτομα πώγωνος βάθη,
εὐ δ' ἐν πεδίλῳ πόδα τιθεὶς ὑπὸ ξυρόν,
κνήμης ἱμάντων ἰσομέτροις ἑλίγμασιν,
ὄγκῳ τε χλανίδος εὖ τεθωρακισμένος,
σχῆμ' ἀξιόχρεων ἐπικαθεὶς βακτηρίᾳ,
ἀλλότριον, οὐκ οἰκεῖον, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ,
ἔλεξεν "ἄνδρες τῆς Ἀθηναίων χθονός."

Athenaeus (509 C) says that Ephippus satirized Plato and his disciples here on the ground that they argued sophistically for money and on account of their luxury. We do not know how much room for criticism Plato and his disciples gave in the matter of dress, but they must have presented a striking contrast to the Cynics and others who affected the appearance of strict philosophers. Plato was an aristocrat, a descendant of an illustrious house, and if we can rely on the information given by Diogenes Laertius (III 9), he was far from being poor. This may be inferred also from the fact that Anaxilas satirized him in the Plusii. His reputation brought men from all parts of the Greek world to listen to his discourses, and it is very probable that, surrounded by such a circle of admirers, he lived as became his position and birth. Whether the poet here refers to presents that Plato received from his hearers or to fees which may have been paid at their option, cannot be known. Plato's attitude towards the democracy and his holding aloof from public affairs are not mentioned in the fragments left us, unless we refer to this head the passage from the Dixidemides of Amphis where he is ridiculed for his sullen look. The only reference to his doctrine is in a fragment from the Olimpiodorus of Alexis (K, II 355):

σῶμα μὲν ἐμοῦ τὸ θνητὸν αὖον ἐγένετο
τὸ δ' ἀθάνατον ἐξῆρε πρὸς τὸν ἀέρα
B. ταῦτ' οὐ σχολὴ Πλάτωνος;

That we have no other reference to his doctrine is doubtless due to the fact that we have only fragments left from the comedies of this period. Aristophon, as has been mentioned, devoted a whole comedy to Plato, but unfortunately no one has preserved us anything from this except Athenaeus, and he was searching for statistics to prove that Philippides, the noted Athenian courier, could properly be placed in a catalogue of lean men whom he found it necessary to mention. The following (K, II 279) is the fragment preserved:

ἐν ἡμέραις τρισὶν
ἰσχνότερον αὐτὸν ἀποφαινῶ Φιλιππίδου
B. οὕτως ἐν ἡμέραις ὀλίγαις νεκροὺς ποιεῖς;

Plato is here perhaps represented as setting forth the merits of his school, but this is only a matter for conjecture, and all that is clear is that he or one of his associates is represented as undertaking some absurdity.

Some of the references to Plato are almost void of ridicule. In a passage from the Hedychares of Theopompus (K, I 737), who belongs to Old as well as to Middle Comedy, a certain character says:

ἓν γάρ ἐστιν οὐδὲ ἕν,
τὰ δὲ δύο μόλις ἕν ἐστιν, ὥς φησιν Πλάτων.

Again, in a passage from Pseudypobolimaeus of Cratinus junior (K, II 292), we find:

ἄνθρωπος εἶ δηλονότι καὶ ψυχὴν ἔχεις;
B. κατὰ μὲν Πλάτων' οὐκ οἶδ', ὑπονοῶ δ' ὧδ' ἔχειν.

In a fragment from an unknown play by Epicrates (K, II 287) we have a comic representation of the work going on under Plato's supervision in the Academy:

Τί Πλάτων
κἀι Σπεύσιππος καὶ Μενέδημος,
πρὸς τίσι νυνὶ διατρίβουσιν;
ποία φροντίς, ποῖος δὲ λόγος
διερευνᾶται παρὰ τοῖσιν;
τάδε μοι πινυτῶς, εἴ τι κατειδὼς
ἥκεις, λέξον πρὸς γᾶς.
B. ἀλλ' οἶδα λέγειν περὶ τῶνδε σαφῶς·
Παναθηναίοις γὰρ ἰδὼν ἀγέλην
μειρακίων
ἐν γυμνασίοις Ἀκαδημείας
ἤκουσα λόγων ἀφάτων ἀτόπων·
περὶ γὰρ φύσεως ἀφοριζόμενοι
διεχώριζον ζῴων τε βίον
δένδρων τε φύσιν λαχάνων τε γένη.
κᾆτ' ἐν τούτοις τὴν κολοκύντην
ἐξήταζον τίνος ἐστὶ γένους.
A. καὶ τί ποτ' ἄρ' ὡρίσαντο καὶ τίνος γένους
εἶναι τὸ φυτόν; δήλωσον εἰ κάτοισθά τι.
B. πρώτιστα μὲν οὖν πάντες ἀναυδεῖς
τότ' ἐπέστησαν, καὶ κύψαντες
χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον διεφρόντιζον.
κᾆτ' ἐξαίφνης ἔτι κυπτόντων
καὶ ζητούντων τῶν μειρακίων
λάχανόν τις ἔφη στρογγύλον εἶναι,
ποίαν δ' ἄλλος, δένδρον δ' ἕτερος.

ταῦτα δ' ἀκούων ἰατρός τις
Σικελᾶς ἀπὸ γᾶς κατέπαρδ' αὐτῶν
ὡς ληρούντων.
A. ἦ που δεινῶς ὠργίσθησαν
χλευάζεσθαι τ' ἐβόησαν·
τὸ γὰρ ἐν λέσχαις ταῖσδε τοιαυτὶ
ποιεῖν ἀπρεπές.
B. οὐδ' ἐμέλησεν τοῖς μειρακίοις·
ὁ Πλάτων δὲ παρὼν καὶ μάλα πράως,
οὐδὲν ὀρινθείς, ἐπέταξ' αὐτοῖς
πάλιν <ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὴν κολοκύτην>
ἀφορίζεσθαι τίνος ἐστὶ γένους·
οἱ δὲ διῆρουν.

This bears a slight resemblance to the scene in the Clouds of Aristophanes (185 foll.) where the disciples of Socrates are represented as investigating the things under the earth, and the whole piece is nothing less than a satire on the foolishness of Plato's teaching. The poet has some knowledge of the method followed in the Academy, the teaching of concepts, but while he ridicules the method, he spares Plato and gives us a different picture of the philosopher from that given in the Dexidemides of Amphis, where he is ridiculed for his sullen look.

From these examples we see that the ridicule to which Plato was subjected was not severe, and that they give us a correct notion of the treatment that he received may be inferred from the fact that Diogenes Laertius quoted some of them to show that he was ridiculed by the comic poets. Eleven poets of the period mention Plato in their comedies, and of the number Alexis mentions him most frequently, or in five plays. But his criticisms are not more severe than those of the other poets, and to judge from the fragments of his works, he did not bring him upon the stage as a character in any of his comedies. He was doubtless brought on the stage in the Plato of Aristophon, and we see that he was one of the characters in the Dexidemides of Amphis.

Alexis did not restrict his ridicule to Plato and the Pythagoreans. He represented the sophists in the Lyceum and Odeum as well as those in the Academy as engaged in idle talking. This fragment is from the Asotodidaskalos (K, II 306), and in it a certain house-servant urges his comrades to abandon philosophy and enjoy life;

τί ταῦτα λῃρεῖς, φληναφῶν ἄνω κάτω
Λύκειον, Ἀκαδήμειαν, Ὠιδείου πύλας,
λήρους σοφιστῶν; οὐ δὲ ἓν τούτων καλόν,
πίνωμεν, ἐμπίνωμεν, ὦ Σίκων, Σίκων,
χαίρωμεν ἕως ἔνεστι τὴν ψυχὴν τρέφειν.

This and a fragment from the Cleophanes of Antiphanes are the only passages from Middle Comedy in which we have possible references to Aristotle and his disciples, and even here it is improbable that Aristotle is meant. The fragment from the Cleophanes cannot refer to him unless it belongs to the very close of the poet's career and to the first three years after the founding of the Peripatetic school. Besides this, it is not likely that either poet would have dared to ridicule Aristotle from the stage, for he did not figure in Athens as an independent philosopher until after the battle of Chaeronea, and then he enjoyed the favor of Alexander and the Macedonian party. It is probable that both poets refer to sophists who used the Lyceum as a lecturing place before a special school was opened there, just as in the case of the Odeum, where no school was opened until Chrysippus assumed the leadership of the Stoics. Antiphanes, in the fragment referred to (K, II 58), also ridicules the sophists, and pretends to give a specimen of the information to be derived from studying under them:

Τὸ δὲ τυραννεῖν ἐστιν
ἢ τί ποτε τὸ σπουδαῖον; ἀκολουθεῖν ἐρεῖς
ἐν τῷ Λυκείῳ μετὰ σοφιστῶν νὴ Δία
λεπτῶν ἀσίτων συκίνων, λέγονθ' ὅτι
τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτ' οὐκ ἔστιν εἴπερ γίνεται·
οὐδ' ἔστι γάρ πω γινόμενον ὃ γίνεται,
οὐτ' εἰ πρότερον ἦν, ἔστιν ὅ γε νῦν γίνεται·
ἔστιν γὰρ οὐκ ὂν οὐδέν· ὃ δὲ μὴ γέγονέ πω,
οὐκ ἔσθ' ὥσπερ γέγονεν, ὅ γε μὴ γέγονε πω·
ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ εἶναι γέγονεν· εἰ δ' οὐκ ἦν ὅθεν,
πῶς ἐγένετ' ἐξ οὐκ ὄντος; οὐχ οἷόν τε γάρ.
εἰ δ' αὐτόθεν ποι γέγονεν, οὐκ ἔσται
κηποι δέποτις εἴη, πόθεν γενήσεται
τοὐκ ὂν εἰς οὐκ ὄν· εἰς οὐκ ὂν γὰρ οὐ δυνήσεται.
ταυτὶ δ' ὅ, τι ἐστὶν οὐδ' ἂν ἀπόλλων μάθοι.

In the Galateia of Alexis (K, II 311) Aristippus is ridiculed for his licentiousness:

ὁ δεσπότης οὑμὸς περὶ λόγους γάρ ποτε
διέτριψε μειρακίσκος ὢν καὶ φιλοσοφεῖν
ἐπέθετο· Κυρηναῖος ἦν ἐνταῦθά τις,
ὥς φασ', Ἀρίστιππος, σοφιστὴς εὐφυής,
μᾶλλον δὲ πρωτεύων ἁπάντων τῶν τότε
ἀχολαστίᾳ τε τῶν γεγονότων διαφέρων.
τούτῳ τάλαντον δοὺς μαθητὴς γίνεται
ὁ δεσποτής.

But Aristippus probably received no more censure from the comic poets than from others, for from Athenaeus (544 *d*) we learn that his philosophy of life, especially as practiced by himself, did not meet with universal approbation.

Alexis wrote a play called the Phaedrus, in which he introduced a certain character philosophizing about the nature of love (K, II 245). The name of the play and the nature of this fragment make it probable that we have here a reference to the Socratic Phaedrus, or that the Platonic dialogue of this name suggested the subject of the comedy to Alexis. The character in the passage attempts to define love, and Denis (II 369) sees in this an evident trace of a lecture of Plato's.

One sect of philosophers that escaped ridicule in the preceding period was the Pythagoreans. When it became popular for the Old Comic poets to ridicule the philosophers from the stage, the Pythagorean association in Lower Italy had been broken up, its members had been killed or scattered, and the school was probably regarded as dead. Philolaus, who came to Thebes about 440 B. C., committed the doctrines of the sect to writing, but to a people not interested in philosophic speculations, the doctrines were as dead as the sect itself, and Old Comedy was not disposed to deal with dead theories any more than with dead men. Plato (Phaedo, 59 C) represents the Pythagoreans, Cebes and Simmias, as being in Athens at the time of the death of Socrates, but with the exception of these two, we know the names of no members of this school who were there during the time of Old Comedy. Not a single fragment has been left us from the comedies of this period in which these philosophers are mentioned. In Middle Comedy no sect was ridiculed more than the Pythagoreans. Whole plays, as we have seen, were devoted to them by Alexis, Aristophon and Cratinus junior. It is a subject of which the comic poets seem never to tire, and from the number of plays devoted to it, one

might infer that the followers of Pythagoras were at this time as well known in Athens as in Crotona in the time of Pythagoras himself, and that they were as strict in the observance of the regulations of their order as in the early days of its existence. Whether Pythagoreans were attracted to Athens through the close relations between the Older Academy and Pythagoreanism, or because of commercial relations between Athens and Tarentum, we do not know. We have no evidence that an association of this order existed there during Middle Comedy, unless we find such in the comic fragments. Alexis in the Tarentini mentions several men in Athens as members of this school, but from the nature of the passage it cannot be known whether the poet is in earnest. The other poets in their ridicule do not mention particular persons, but it is not probable that they would have paid so much attention to the subject if there had been no Pythagoreans nearer than Tarentum.

In the plays devoted to these philosophers the ridicule was not provoked so much by hostility as by contempt, and the desire to excite laughter was the ruling motive. It was not their doctrine that was ridiculed, but what they ate and wore—their abstinence from flesh and wine, their scanty fare, their poor clothes, their dirt and their lice. From the fragments left we cannot tell whether the poets knew anything about their philosophy or not. They knew the Pythagoreans as vegetarians and as opposed to the use of wine; these were popular notions about them, and just such characteristics could most easily be turned into ridicule. If the poets had been opposed to their teaching, we should expect here as well as in the case of Plato something more than this shallow criticism. They found in the philosophers a vast storehouse from which to draw material for their comedies, and it would not be far from right to conclude that they would have shed tears of genuine though perhaps selfish sorrow over the grave of the last philosopher.

The Pythagoreans are never mentioned by the comic poets as immoral or ungodly, on the contrary they are commended for their piety; this, however, is coupled with ridicule and may have been invented for the occasion. The reference to their piety occurs in a fragment from the Pythagorean of Aristophon (K, II 280):

ἔφη τε καταβὰς εἰς δίαιταν τῶν κάτω
ἰδεῖν ἑκάστους, διαρέρειν δὲ πάμπολυ

τοὺς Πυθαγοριστὰς τῶν νεκρῶν· μόνοισι γὰρ
τούτοισι τὸν Πλούτωνα συσσιτεῖν ἔφη
δι' εὐσέβειαν. β. εὐχερῆ θεὸν λέγεις,
εἰ τοῖς ῥύπου μεστοῖσιν ἥδεται ξυνών.
ἐσθίουσί τε
λάχανά τε καὶ πίνουσιν ἐπὶ τούτοις ὕδωρ
φθεῖρας δὲ καὶ τρίβωνα τήν τ' ἀλουσίαν
οὐδεὶς ἂν ὑπομείνειε τῶν νεωτέρων.

In another fragment from the same play (K, II 279) we have the same kind of ridicule:

πρὸς τῶν θεῶν οἰόμεθα τοὺς πάλαι ποτὲ
τοὺς Πυθαγοριστὰς γινομένους οὕτως ῥυπᾶν
ἑκόντας, ἢ φορεῖν τρίβωνας ἡδέως;
οὐκ ἔστι τούτων οὐδέν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ·
ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης, οὐκ ἔχοντες οὐδὲ ἕν,
τῆς εὐτελείας πρόφασιν εὑρόντες καλὴν
ὅρους ἔπηξαν τοῖς πένησι χρησίμους.
ἐπεὶ παράθες αὐτοῖσιν ἰχθῦς ἢ κρέας
κἂν μὴ κατεσθίωσι καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους,
ἐθέλω κρέμασθαι δεκάκις.

In a third fragment (K, II 278) he compares them to Phidippides on account of their abstinence. Alexis in the Tarentini (K, II 378) ridicules their frugality:

Πυθαγορισμοὶ καὶ λόγοι
λεπτοὶ διεσμιλευμέναι τὲ φροντίδες
τρεφουσ' ἐκείνους, τὰ δὲ καθ' ἡμέραν τάδε·
ἄρτος καθαρὸς εἷς ἑκατέρῳ, ποτήριον
ὕδατος· τοσαῦτα ταῦτα. Β. δεσμωτηρίου
λέγεις δίαιταν. πάντες οὕτως οἱ σοφοὶ
διάγουσι καὶ τοιαῦτα κακοπαθοῦσί που;
Α. τρυφῶσιν οὗτοι πρὸς ἑτέρους. ἆρ' οἶσθ' ὅτι
Μελανιππίδης ἑταῖρός ἐστι καὶ Φάων
καὶ Φυρόμαχος καὶ Φᾶνος, οἳ δι' ἡμέρας
δειπνοῦσι πέμπτης ἀλφίτων κοτύλην μίαν;

In the same play Alexis (K, II 378) makes sport of their vegetarianism:

οἱ πυθαγορίζοντες γὰρ, ὡς ἀκούομεν,
οὔτ' ὄψον ἐσθίουσιν οὔτ' ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἕν

ἔμψυχον, οἶνόν τ' οὐχὶ πίνουσιν μόνοι.
B. Ἐπιχαρίδης μέντοι κύνας κατεσθίει,
τῶν Πυθαγοριστῶν εἷς. *A.* ἀποκτείνας γέ που·
οὐκ ἔτι γάρ ἐστ' ἔμψυχον.

Of the men whom Alexis mentions here as Pythagoreans, nothing further is known. The real design of the last fragment was to ridicule Epicharides, whom Alexis mentions in a passage from the Phaedrus as being such a spendthrift that he squandered his paternal estate in five days. Antiphanes in a fragment from the Monuments (K, II 76) also makes sport of their vegetarianism:

τῶν Πυθαγοριστῶν δ' ἔτυχον ἄθλιοί τινες
ἐν τῇ χαράδρᾳ τρώγοντες ἅλιμα καὶ κακὰ
τοιαῦτα συλλέγοντες ἐν τῷ κωρύκῳ.

Again in the Wallet (K, II 67):

πρῶτον μὲν ὥσπερ πυθαγορίζων ἐσθίει
ἔμψυχον οὐδέν, τῆς δὲ πλείστης τοὐβολοῦ
μάζης μελαγχρῆ μερίδα λαμβάνων λέπει.

Besides these fragments casual references to the Pythagoreans occur here and there, but little importance can be attached to them except in so far as they serve to show how common it was to speak of these philosophers and how popular the subject was regarded by the comic poets. Amphis and Mnesimachus wrote each a play called the Alcmaean (K, II 236 and 436), and in a fragment left from the play by Mnesimachus we have a reference to the Pythagoreans. This was quoted by Diogenes Laertius (VII 37) as a specimen of the satire directed against these philosophers. Besides this, the title of the plays is significant, and it is probable that the name of this supposed disciple of Pythagoras was used as the title of comedies in which new features of this popular subject were brought out.

The Attitude of the Poets of New Comedy.

We pass now to New Comedy, "the comedy of character and manners." Here the philosophers are still the objects of criticism, but it is neither the abuse of Old nor the ridicule of Middle Comedy. It is nothing more than an attempt to render ludicrous a subject that had been ridiculed by the comic poets for more

than a hundred years. In one or two cases the tone is that of Middle Comedy, but this is not the rule. The criticism of the philosophers is now for the most part put into the mouths of slaves, courtesans, and cooks, and Denis is right when he says (II 526) that this shows how little seriousness there was in it. In this period, just as in the preceding, nothing is said about the corrupt influence of the philosophers. The prejudice against them seems to have almost disappeared. That they were still objects of criticism was due to the profession of the comic poet and to the example set by Old and Middle Comedy.

The philosophical schools in Athens were now more numerous and more popular than in the preceding period. The Peripatetic school was founded near the close of the period assigned to Middle Comedy, and after the death of Aristotle was led by Theophrastus, Strato, and Lyco. The Academy was still flourishing. The Epicurean school was founded in 306 B. C., and in 300 B. C. Zeno founded the Stoic school. This is the beginning of a period which worked a complete revolution in favor of philosophy, so much so that in 151 B. C. an embassy of three philosophers was sent from Athens to Rome to secure a diminution of the fine imposed on the Athenians for making a raid upon the town of Oropus. During this period, just as in the preceding, the philosophers met with little opposition from the state. In 323–2 B. C. a charge of sacrilege was brought against Aristotle, and 306 B. C. all the philosophers were banished from Athens; but in both cases the opposition arose from other causes than a real prejudice against philosophy. Some of the philosophers of this time were very popular. Diogenes Laertius (V 37) tells us that the popularity of Theophrastus was such that a certain Agonides who brought a charge of impiety against him lost his suit and came near incurring a penalty besides. In the same passage he tells us that the number of Theophrastus' disciples amounted to two thousand. We also learn from Diogenes (VII 173) that when the poet Sositheus ridiculed Cleanthes, who was present at the time, the spectators, out of sympathy with the philosopher, forced the poet to leave the theater. The fact that during New Comedy only one play was devoted exclusively to the philosophers indicated that a demand for comedies of this kind had decreased.

In only one fragment do we find anything that seems to show real hostility to philosophy, and this cannot be regarded as such if we consider the circumstances under which it was written.

The fragment is from the Knight of Alexis (K, II 327), and the satire is directed against Xenocrates and the philosophy of the Academy, the only case in which Xenocrates or the Academy is mentioned in New Comedy:

> *τοῦτ' ἔστιν 'Ακαδήμεια, τοῦτο Ξενοκράτης;*
> *πολλ' ἀγαθὰ δοῖεν οἱ θεοὶ Δημητρίῳ*
> *καὶ τοῖς νομοθέταις, διότι τοὺς τὰς τῶν λόγων,*
> *ὥς φασι, δυνάμεις παραδιδόντας τοῖς νέοις*
> *εἰς κόραχας ἐρρίφασιν ἐκ τῆς 'Αττικῆς.*

Alexis lived and wrote thirty years after the beginning of New Comedy, but he lived through the whole time of Middle Comedy, and his attitude here seems to be that of the poets of one of the preceding periods. The tone is not very unlike that of Aristophanes in the Clouds, but it was not uttered under ordinary circumstances and cannot be taken as characteristic of New Comedy. Meineke and Kock think the reference here to Xenocrates sufficient evidence for concluding that the play was brought out before Xenocrates' death (315 B. C.). This would place the banishment of philosophers in the same period, but Hoffman[1] places this in 306 B. C., which is evidently the correct date. There is little probability that the Demetrius referred to in the fragment is, as Meineke and Kock think, Demetrius of Phalerum. Reference is made here to a decree proposed by a certain Sophokles (D. L. V 38), in accordance with which all the philosophers were banished from Athens. That this should have occurred during the rule of Demetrius of Phalerum is altogether improbable, and it is impossible that he should have been influential in banishing the philosophers. But this is indicated in the fragment. Diogenes Laertius (V 75) tells us that Demetrius of Phalerum was a disciple of Theophrastus, and he numbers him with the philosophers. In IV 14 he says that when the Athenians sold Xenocrates because he was not able to pay the tax of twelve drachmae levied on the resident aliens, Demetrius bought him and restored him to liberty; and in V 39 that he assisted Theophrastus in acquiring a private garden. But Theophrastus, as well as the other philosophers, was in consequence of this decree banished from Athens. All the evidence, unless it is the reference to Xenocrates, serves to prove that this was written not before Xenocrates' death, but

[1] De Lege contra Philosophos.

after it, and that the Demetrius referred to is Demetrius Poliorcetes. In 307 B. C. Demetrius Poliorcetes drove Demetrius of Phalerum from Athens, proclaiming that his object was the expulsion of the Macedonian garrison and the liberation of the people. What can be more probable than that some base Sophokles, wishing to curry favor with the new ruler, should have proposed a decree banishing the philosophers, with whom Demetrius of Phalerum had identified himself. The fact that Demetrius Poliorcetes left Athens the next year (306 B. C.), and that in the same year the decree was repealed and the philosophers allowed to return, strengthens the supposition that it is Demetrius Poliorcetes to whom reference is made.

We evidently have here an attempt of the poet to echo the popular feeling and praise Demetrius Poliorcetes, who had restored to the Athenians their ancient constitution. But that he was not expressing the popular feeling can be seen from the fact that as soon as Demetrius left Athens the decree was repealed, the philosophers were allowed to return, and Sophokles was fined ten talents for proposing the decree.[1] In the reference to Xenocrates we probably have the words of some one who has heard of the nature and influence of the instruction that had been given in the Academy. It is a little strange that Polemo is not mentioned instead, but Xenocrates had been at the head of the Academy twenty-five years, when he was succeeded by Polemo, and was doubtless considered the author of much that was still taught there. Besides this, the Academy had been closed, and so far as instruction was concerned was as dead as Xenocrates.

The only poet of this period who devoted a whole comedy to the philosophers was Philemon, but we have too little left from it to form any notion of the way in which he treated his subject. Denis (II 433) says that Philemon wrote this comedy to please the masses, who still retained their old prejudice against philosophy. But the attitude of the people towards Theophrastus, and later towards the Stoic Cleanthes, shows that the opposition to free thought had well nigh ceased. It is therefore probable that Philemon was simply following the example of the poets of Middle Comedy, to whom he stands so closely related in time. This play, the Philosophers, was doubtless devoted to several schools, but the only fragment left (K, II 502) refers to Zeno:

[1] Diogenes Laertius, II 38.

φιλοσοφίαν καινὴν γὰρ οὗτος φιλοσοφεῖ·
πεινῆν διδάσκει καὶ μαθητὰς λαμβάνει.
εἷς ἄρτος, ὄψον ἰσχάς, ἐπιπιεῖν ὕδωρ.

Diogenes Laertius (III 27) takes this as an unintentional encomium on Zeno, and this, with two references to the Cynic Crates and one to Monimus, seems to have been all that he thought worth collecting from the whole of New Comedy. One of the references to Crates is from a play of Philemon's (K, II 523), probably the Philosophers:

καὶ τοῦ θέρους μὲν εἶχεν ἱμάτιον δασύ,
ἵν' ἐγκρατὴς ᾖ, τοῦ δὲ χειμῶνος ῥάκος.

From the Pyrrhus of Philemon (K, II 496) we have a third fragment:

οἱ φιλόσοφοι ζητοῦσιν, ὡς ἀκήκοα,
περὶ τοῦτό τ' αὐτοῖς πολὺς ἀναλοῦται χρόνος,
τί ἐστιν ἀγαθόν, κοὐδὲ εἷς εὕρηκέ πω
τί ἐστιν. ἀρετὴν καὶ φρόνησίν φασι, καὶ
λέγουσι πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ τί ἀγαθόν.
ἐν ἀγρῷ διατρίβων τήν τε γῆν σκάπτων ἐγὼ
νῦν οὖρον· εἰρήνη 'στίν· ὦ Ζεῦ φίλτατε,
τῆς ἐπαφροδίτου καὶ φιλανθρώπου θεοῦ.
γάμους, ἑορτάς, συγγενεῖς, παῖδας, φίλους,
πλοῦτον, ὑγίειαν, σῖτον, οἶνον, ἡδονὴν
αὕτη δίδωσι· ταῦτα πάντ' ἂν ἐκλίπῃ,
τέθνηκε κοινῇ πᾶς ὁ τῶν ζώντων βίος.

Philemon may have expressed here his view as to the utility of philosophy, but it is more probable that the philosophers were brought in to help out the situation. The real design of the piece seems to have been to deprecate the unsettled condition of things in Athens at the time, and to advocate peace. The tone is somewhat like that of Dicaeopolis in the opening of the Acharnians of Aristophanes. There is no statement as to the time when the Pyrrhus was brought out, but the reference to the Stoic school in *ἀρετὴ καὶ φρόνησις* in line 4 shows that the date was later than 300 B. C. If the real design was to advocate peace and not to ridicule the philosophers, it would be safe to place the time of production about 295 B. C. Athens had at this time been for over twenty years the sport of the contending successors of Alexander, and it was now besieged by Demetrius Poliorcetes and reduced to extreme famine.

The philosophers that received most censure from the poets of New Comedy were the Stoics. Epicurus and his school were received with more favor. The comic poets had at last found one philosopher who deserved praise. He had solved the problem which had engaged the attention of philosophers for generations; he alone knew the nature of the *summum bonum*. But Epicurus did not receive universal commendation from them. Some of this praise is nothing less than irony. Athenaeus (278 f.) quotes him as saying that *τὸ ἀγαθόν* was to be found only in the gratification of the appetites, and that this popular notion of his philosophy was the notion the comic poets had, or pretended to have, of it can be seen from an examination of a few fragments. In a fragment from the Manslayer of Bato (K, III 327) we have:

ἐξὸν γυναῖκ' ἔχοντα κατακεῖσθαι καλήν,
καὶ Λεσβίου χυτρῖδε λαμβάνειν δύο·
ὁ φρόνιμος <οὗτός> ἐστιν, τοῦτο τἀγαθόν.
Ἐπίκουρος ἔλεγε ταῦθ' ἃ νῦν ἐγὼ λέγω,
εἰ τοῦτον ἔζων πάντες ὃν ἐγὼ ζῶ βίον,
οὔτ' ἄτοπος ἦν ἄν οὔτε μοικὸς οὐδὲ εἷς.

Again from the Philetaeri of Hegesippus (K, III 314)—

Ἐπίκουρος ὁ σοφὸς ἀξιώσαντός τινος
εἰπεῖν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὅ, τι ποτ' ἐστὶ τἀγαθόν,
ὃ διὰ τέλους ζητοῦσιν, εἶπεν ἡδονήν.
εὖ γ', ὦ κράτιστ' ἄνθρωπε καὶ σοφώτατε·
τοῦ γὰρ μασᾶσθαι κρεῖττον οὐκ ἔστ' οὐδὲ ἓν
ἀγαθόν· πρόσεστιν ἡδονῇ γὰρ τἀγαθόν.

In a fragment from the Synexapaton of Bato (K, III 328) a slave who has ruined the youth entrusted to his care, on being remonstrated with by his master, defends his course by professing to have followed the philosophy of Epicurus:

ἀπολώλεκας τὸ μειράκιόν μου παραλαβών,
ἄνθρωπε, καὶ πέπεικας ἐλθεῖν εἰς βίον
ἀλλότριον αὑτοῦ, καὶ πότους ἑωθινοὺς
πίνει διὰ σὲ νῦν, πρότερον οὐκ ἐθισμένον.
B. εἶτ' εἰ μεμάθηκε, δέσποτα, ζῆν, ἐγκαλεῖς;
A. ζῆν δ' ἐστὶ τὸ τοιαῦθ'; *B.* ὡς λέγουσιν οἱ σοφοί.
ὁ γοῦν Ἐπίκουρός φησιν εἶναι τἀγαθὸν
τὴν ἡδονὴν δήπουθεν· οὐκ ἔστιν δ' ἔχειν
ταύτην ἑτέρωθεν, ἐκ δε τοῦ ζῆν παγκάλως
ἴσως ἅπαντας εὐτυχεῖν δώσεις ἐμοί.

In the latter part of the same fragment the philosophers are represented as carrying out this popular notion of Epicureanism to such an extent that they even get drunk. But the sweeping nature of the statement and the special reference to the Stoics show that there was little seriousness in it. It is only a joke at the expense of these sober philosophers:

ἑώρακας οὖν φιλόσοφον, εἰπέ μοι, τινὰ
μεθύοντ' ἐπὶ τοῦτοις θ' οἷς λέγεις κήλούμενον;
B. ἅπαντας· οἱ γοῦν τὰς ὀφρῦς ἐπηρκότες
καὶ τὸν φρόνιμον ζητοῦντες ἐν τοῖς περιπάτοις
καὶ ταῖς διατριβαῖς ὥσπερ ἀποδεδρακότα.

Athenaeus (279) quotes these lines to show that the comic poets were not in sympathy with the philosophy of Epicurus, for he says that they inveighed against pleasure and incontinence. Whatever may be said of the first two fragments, the third cannot be taken as expressing a favorable opinion of Epicureanism. It is nothing less than condemnation of this doctrine, and it shows the result of such a theory when put into practice. If we form an opinion of Epicurus from the references of the comic poets, we conclude that he was a voluptuary, and that his aim was to take in the whole round of pleasures in life. We get no idea of the sober philosopher, whose philosophy aimed not at the gratification of individual appetites, but at the happiness of a whole life, and who regarded happiness and virtue as necessarily concomitant.[1] According to Athenaeus (278), Epicurus stated his doctrine in such a way that this popular notion could be taken of it, and it was just this view that presented features suitable for comedy. The comic poets took, as it were, the place of a press. What they uttered on the stage reached the whole people, and Denis is right in saying they contributed as much as the philosophers of the Academy and the Stoics in giving Epicurus the bad reputation which follows him still. The fact that Epicurus defined pleasure as the greatest good gave the poets ample room for invention, and that they distorted the correct view was quite natural, as we do not expect a true reproduction of any philosophy on the comic stage.

With the exception of Bato, none of the poets of New Comedy have left anything that is to be taken as a censure of the philosophy of Epicurus. But it may be well to state that only four of

[1] D. L. X 138.

them mention him at all, and one of these is Menander. None of them, however, have left us any favorable comments on the Stoics. This is just what we expect if Epicurus was in their eyes the ideal philosopher, for no two systems stood in stronger contrast. In a fragment from the Syntrophi of Damoxenus (K, III 350) the philosophy of Epicurus is compared with that of the Stoics:

'Επίκουρος οὕτω κατεπύκνου τὴν ἡδονήν·
ἐμασᾶτ' ἐπιμελῶς, εἶδε τἀγαθὸν μόνος
ἐκεῖνος οἷόν ἐστιν· οἱ δ' ἐν τῇ στοᾷ
ζητοῦσι συνεχῶς οἷόν ἐστ' οὐκ εἰδότες.
οὐκοῦν ὅ γ' οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἀγνοοῦσι δέ,
οὐδ' ἂν ἑτέρῳ δοίησαν. B. οὕτω συνδοκεῖ.

A fragment from the Manslayer of Bato (K, III 326) was directed against the Stoics:

τῶν φιλοσόφων τοὺς σώφρονας ἐνταυθοῖ καλῶ
τοὺς ἀγαθὸν αὑτοῖς οὐ διδύντας οὐδὲ ἕν,
τοὺς τον φρόνιμον ζητοῦντας ἐν τοῖς περιπάτοις
καὶ ταῖς διατριβαῖς ὥσπερ ἀποδεδρακότα.
ἄνθρωπ' ἀλάστωρ, διὰ τί συμβολὰς ἔχων
νήφεις; τί τηλικοῦτον ἀδικεῖς τοὺς θεούς;
τί τἀργύριον, ἄνθρωπε, τιμιώτερον
σαυτοῦ τέθεικας ἢ πέφυκε τῇ φύσει;
ἀλυσιτελὴς εἶ τῇ πόλει πίνων ὕδωρ·
τὸν γὰρ γεωργὸν καὶ τὸν ἔμπορον κακοῖς.
ἐγὼ δὲ τὰς προσόδους μεθύων καλὰς ποιῶ.

In a fragment from the Pilargyrus of Theognetus (K, III 364) a certain character is associated with a member of the Stoic school. The Stoic puts into practice his philosophy and tries to impress his views upon his companion. But the latter is disgusted with such a partner and passionately bursts out with:

ἄνθρωπ' ἀπολεῖς με, τῶν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ποικίλης
στοᾶς λογαρίων ἀνεπεπεπλησμένος νοσεῖς·
" ἀλλότριόν ἐσθ' ὁ πλοῦτος ἀνθρώπῳ, πάχνη·
σοφία δ' ἴδιον, κρύσταλλος. οὐδεὶς πώποτε
ταύτην λαβὼν ἀπώλεσ'," ὦ τάλας ἐγώ,
οἵῳ μ' ὁ δαίμων φιλοσόφῳ συνῴκισεν.
ἐπαρίστερ' ἔμαθες, ὦ πόνηρε, γράμματα·
ἀνέστροφέν σου τὸν βίον τὰ βιβλία.

In a fragment from an unknown play by Phoenicides (K, III 334) a courtesan who has associated successively with a soldier, a physician, and a philosopher, tells how she was disappointed in the soldier and the physician, and then gives her experience with the philosopher:

τρίτῳ συνέζευξ' ἡ τύχη με φιλοσόφῳ
πώγων' ἔχοντι καὶ τρίβωνα καὶ λόγον.
εἰς προὔπτον ἦλθον ἐμπεσοῦσα δὴ κακόν·
οὐδὲν ἐδίδου γάρ· εἴ τι δ' αἰτοίμην, ἔφη
οὐκ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τἀργύριον. ἔστω κακόν,
διὰ τοῦτο δός μοι, ῥῖψον· οὐκ ἐπείθετο.

This is satire called forth by inconsistencies betweeen the theory and practice of members of the Stoic school. The philosophers, especially the Stoics, were doubtless guilty of many things that seemed to the people to be foolishness, and it was just these peculiarities, more striking in a philosopher than in any one else, that formed the standard by which they were often judged.[1] The voluntary deaths of Zeno and Cleanthes, the life led by the Cynic Crates and his eccentric wife who followed him everywhere, gave the people grounds for regarding these philosophers as abnormal specimens of humanity. It is not strange, therefore, that we find in the Thunderbolt of Anaxippus (K, III 299) the following comment on the philosophers in practical life:

οἴμοι, φιλοσοφεῖς, ἀλλὰ τούς γε φιλοσόφους
ἐν τοῖς λόγοις φρονοῦντας εὑρίσκω μόνον,
ἐν τοῖσι δ' ἔργοις ὄντας ἀνόητους ὁρῶ.

Damoxenus in the Syntrophi (K, III 349) puts in the mouth of two characters, one of them a cook, a conversation about the philosophy of Democritus and Epicurus. The cook, to show that he has acted in accordance with his theory that to be a good cook one must be well versed in philosophy, states that he has spent more than two years in the school of Epicurus, paying for the instruction received the sum of four talents. After making this statement, he continues in the following strain:

διόπερ μάγειρον ὅταν ἴδῃς ἀγράμματον
μὴ Δημόκριτόν τε πάντα διανεγνωκότα,
μᾶλλον δὲ κατέχοντα [καταγέλα ὡς κενοῦ]
καὶ τὸν Ἐπικούρου κανόνα, μινθώσας ἄφες.

[1] See Denis, II 530.

ὡς ἐκ διατριβῆς τοῦτο δεῖ γὰρ εἰδέναι,
τίν' ἔχει διαφορὰν πρῶτον, ὦ βέλτιστε σύ,
γλαυκίσκος ἐν χειμῶνι καὶ θέρει, πάλιν
ποῖος περὶ δύσιν Πλειάδος συνειδέναι
ἰχθὺς ὑπό προπάς τ' ἐστὶ χρησιμώτατος.

What the character in the passage says as to the necessity of knowing the whole of Democritus is to be taken as a satire on the pretensions of the Athenian cooks of the time. His reference to the fish that are edible at different seasons of the year is similar to a statement made by a cook in a fragment from a play of Sosipater's (K, III 315), and such information was probably to be found in the cook-books of the day. But this has been obtained from his studies in the school of Epicurus. The reference to Democritus shows that the poet knew that these two systems were related. But when he mentions the Canon as one of the essentials, or gets the whole of Democritus from studying in the school of Epicurus, we begin to doubt whether he knew wherein they were similar. If he had been familiar with the two systems and had wished to include the Canon of Epicurus, in addition to the whole of Democritus, in the cook's accomplishments, he would naturally have placed this first as an elementary matter and then have loaded him with the vast amount of knowledge to be obtained from the works of Democritus.

The scholiast in commenting on line 96 of the Clouds says that Diphilus devoted a whole comedy to the philosopher Boedas, and that the ridicule to which the philosopher was subjected was severe. Nothing besides this is known of a philosopher of this name, and in the fragments left from the comedies of this poet, only one reference to a philosopher occurs, and this refers to Stilpo (M, 1071):

Στίλπωνός ἐστι βύσμαθ' ὁ Χαρίνου λόγος.

The testimony of the scholiast, however, is worthy of some consideration. He was familiar with the treatment that Hippo received at the hands of Cratinus, and we cannot conclude that his reference to Diphilus and Boedas is without some foundation. If the ridicule was similar to that in the Clouds, which is not probable, it can only be taken as an isolated case, and must have been due to personal motives or to the peculiarities of this unknown philosopher.

It is an interesting fact to note that the two great comic poets who stand, the one at the beginning and the other near the close of Greek comedy, identified themselves closely with the philosophers. Epicharmus, as we have seen, was regarded in antiquity as a Pythagorean, and his writings show traces of his studies in the schools of Pythagoras and others. Menander, the last great comic poet of the Greeks, was a disciple of Theophrastus.[1] He was also an intimate friend of Epicurus. In the letter from Glycera to Menander (Alciphron II, ep. 4) Epicurus and Theophrastus are mentioned as the special friends of Menander. If this friendship had not been well known in antiquity, it is not probable that Alciphron would have mentioned it here, whatever may be said of his authority for the letter. In the Greek Anthology[2] we find an epigram which Menander dedicated to Epicurus and Themistocles:

> *Χαῖρε Νεοκλείδα δίδυμον γένος, ὧν ὁ μὲν ὑμῶν*
> *πατρίδα δουλοσύνης ῥύσαθ', ὁ δ' ἀφροσύνης.*

These references leave no doubt as to Menander's attitude towards these two philosophers. His intimacy with them would have prevented an unfavorable criticism of their philosophy even if he had been disposed to ridicule their profession, but other philosophers were spared as well as these. He rarely refers to the philosophers except as *οἱ σοφοί*, or *οἱ τὰς ὀφρῦς αἴροντες*, terms frequently applied to them, but when he does, it is with no disapprobation. The only case in which it is possible to regard what he says as ridicule is in a fragment from the Esquire (K, III 72), where he refers to the Cynic Monimos:

> *Μόνιμός τις ἦν ἄνθρωπος, ὦ Φίλων, σοφός,*
> *ἀδοξότερος μικρῷ δ' B. ὁ τὴν πήραν ἔχων;*
> *A. πήρας μὲν οὖν τρεῖς· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος ῥᾳ̃μά τι*
> *ἐφθέγξατ' οὐδὲν ἐμφερὲς μὰ τὸν Δία*
> *τῷ γνῶθι σαυτόν, οὐδὲ τοῖς βοωμένοις*
> *τούτοις· ὑπερεῖδε τᾶυθ' ὁ προσαιτῶν καὶ ῥυπῶν*
> *τὸ γὰρ ὑπολῃφθὲν τῦφον εἶναι πᾶν ἔφη.*

Diogenes Laertius (VI 83) did not regard this as ridicule, and even if it is to be taken as such, it is no more than might have been expected from any one outside of the Cynic and Stoic schools, for people, poet, and many philosophers must have

[1] Pamphilus in D. L. V 37. [2] Ed. Jacobs, I p. 136.

regarded the Cynics as a contemptible set. In a fragment from an unknown play (K, III 161) Menander refers to philosophy, the only case in which he mentions the subject. But this is worth more than anything else that he has left us to enable us to form an opinion as to his estimation of philosophical enquiry:

ὁ πάντα βουληθεὶς ἂν ἄνθρωπος ποιεῖν
πᾶν ἂν γένοιτο· πλούσιος τρόπον τινά·
πάλιν φιλόσοφός τινι μαθήσει χρώμενος·
τὸ σῶμ' ὑγιαίνει τινὰ δίαιταν προσφέρων.

While this shows no decided preference so far as the poet himself is concerned, it cannot be taken as a mere reference to philosophy. It is with no sneer that he speaks of this profession here: he mentions it rather as something to be desired. The fact that he mentions it along with health and wealth is of itself significant, and if we knew nothing of his attitude towards Epicurus and Theophrastus it would be safe to take this as a favorable comment on philosophy.

From Menander's intimacy with these philosophers and his studies under one of them we may expect his plays to abound in popular Epicurean and Peripatetic dogmas, but in this we shall be disappointed. There are few clear-cut philosophical views in his writings; but, as has been said before, it was not the aim of the comic poet to reproduce any philosophy on the stage. It was only those features that had taken a firm hold upon him that would crop out here and there in his writings. In two or three points Menander shows kinship with Epicurus and in one with the Peripatetics. His constant reference to pain and the desirability of being free from it may be sufficient to place him with Epicurus. This is with him the great evil to which mortals are subject. There is not a greater evil among men. But if this shows his Epicurean leaning, he is not an Epicurean in the popular sense. It is not the gratification of the appetites that is to be desired above everything else, but freedom from pain. The following are two fragments from unknown comedies (K, III 194):

οὐκ ἔστι λύπης, ἄν περ ὀρθῶς τις σκοπῇ,
ἄλγημα μεῖζον τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις φύσει.

Again (K, III 195):

πολλῶν φύσει τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις κακῶν
ὄντων μέγιστόν ἐστιν ἡ λύπη κακόν.

Similar expressions are found in the Monosticha, lines 296, 383, 414, 731. In one fragment (K, III 202) he probably shows kinship with Epicurus in his doctrine of the annihilation of the soul at death:[1]

μὴ κλαῖε τοὺς θανόντας· οὐ γὰρ ὠφελεῖ
τὰ δάκρυ' ἀναισθνήτῳ γεγονότι καὶ νεκρῶ.

His gods are the gods of Epicurus who do not busy themselves with the affairs of men, but rather secure their own happiness and let the affairs of the world go as they will. In a fragment from the Epitrepontes (M, 901) we find:

οἴει τοσάντην τοὺς θεοὺς ἄγειν σχολήν,
ὥστε τὸ κακὸν καὶ τἀγαθὸν καθ' ἡμέραν
νέμειν ἑκάστω, Σμικρίνη;

In two fragments (K, III 82 and 140) he apparently reflects the doctrine of the Peripatetics in reference to one of the forces at work in the universe:

ταὐτόματόν ἐστιν ὡς ἔοικέ που θεός,
σώζει πε πολλὰ τῶν ἀοράτων πραγμάτων.

In the second:

οὐ παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ τὴν πρόνοιαν αἰτίαν
κρίνων ἂν ὀρθῶς ὑπολαβεῖν τίς μοι δοκει,
ἀλλ' ἐστι καὶ ταὐτόματον ἔνια χρήσιμον.

According to Ditandy (196) the influence of Theophrastus is seen in his art rather than in his philosophy, as he gave the poet, either verbally or in his work on comedy, excellent advice as to the construction of a play, and it is from the same source that Menander learned the art of portraying the passions and characters of men.

[1] D. L. X 125.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 029 561 160 1

B 178
.G7
Copy 1

L.IBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 029 561 160 1

METAL EDGE, INC. 2008 PH 7.5 TO 9.5 P.A.T.